III.   REMARKS

Claims 1-17 were presented for prosecution and remain pending. Claims 2, 8, and 14-17 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter if rewritten in independent form. Applicant greatly appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter. Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-13 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Fields et al., US 6,605,120, (Fields). Applicant has herein amended claims 1, 4, 7 and 12. No new matter is believed added.

Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application.

Applicant respectfully traverses the outstanding rejections because Fields fails to teach each and every feature recited in the claimed invention. For example, claim 1 recites "stripping an active element from a web page being stored at the web server such that the active element is not stored at the web server; and … inserting a new active element into the web page when the web page is requested from the web server, wherein the new active element performs a similar action to that of the active element that was stripped by the active element filter." In other words, claim 1 recites a system in which: (1) an active element is removed from the web page upon being stored such that the active element is not stored on the server, and (2) upon being served, a new active element is inserted back into the web page to perform a similar function to that of the removed active element. Using such a system, the server can avoid storing active elements that may contain viruses.

Conversely, Fields teaches a system in which upon receiving a request for a web page at a host web site:

(1) the host (i.e., pass though) web site 103 loads a web page from a content server web site 107,

(2) removes/filters content (i.e., articles) from the loaded pages,

(3) places the removed content into a reformatted page; and

(4) serves the reformatted page to a client.

This process is described and illustrated in detail in Figure 2, and columns 4-5 of Fields. Nowhere does Fields teach stripping active elements such that the active elements are not stored at the web server. In fact, Fields teaches just the opposite – a local cache 131 for storing "information parsed from the page and cached locally." (See column 5, lines 46-47.) In other words, Fields teaches that the filtered material is stored at the hosting Web server 103.

Moreover, in Field, the web page retrieved from the content server 107 is never served to the client, so Field cannot possibly teach "inserting a new active element into the web page (which was previously stripped) when the web page is requested from the web server." In Field, once the content is filtered out of the original web page, a whole new web page is created and served to the client with the filtered content. Nowhere is it taught in Field that a new active element is inserted back into the original web page, as stored on the server.

Furthermore, nowhere does Field teach inserting *new* active elements back into the *original* web page. Rather, Field teaches inserting the *same* content that was stripped back into a *new* web page. Moreover, in one claimed embodiment (e.g., claim 4), Applicant recites generating "new active elements for requested web pages using constructs stored in compiled code of the web server." Clearly, such a feature is not taught in the sections identified in the Office Action since Field does not generate, use, or even suggest "new" active elements. Fields merely moves content from one web page to another.

Accordingly, for these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1 (and similarly independent claims 7 and 12) is not anticipated by Fields. Each of the claims not specifically addressed herein is believed allowable for the reasons stated above, as well as their own unique features.

Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

_____
Michael F. Hoffman
Reg. No. 40,019

Dated: 6/21/07

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street
Albany, NY 12207
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile